



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,971	01/15/2004	Klaus Hartig	44046.203.143.22	8328

22859 7590 08/11/2006

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.
200 SOUTH SIXTH STREET
SUITE 4000
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, ANDREW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/759,971

Applicant(s)

HARTIG ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew T. Piziali

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-9,11,13,15-20 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-9,11,13,15-20 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/18/2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/13/2006 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The examiner has withdrawn the rejections of claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 14 and 21-23 based on the cancellation of these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,090,481 to Depauw et al. (hereinafter referred to as Depauw) in view of USPN 5,248,545 to Proscia.

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-20 and 24, Depauw discloses a coating carried by a substrate having a surface comprising from the substrate surface outwardly an inner dielectric layer, a first infrared reflective layer, an intermediate dielectric layer, a second infrared reflective layer, and an outer dielectric layer (column 3, lines 26-39). Depauw discloses that each dielectric layer can be a composite layer formed of successive subsidiary layers of different compositions from each other (column 5, lines 31-40 and Table A). Depauw discloses that the dielectric materials include zinc oxide, tin oxide, and silicon nitride (column 5, lines 23-30). Depauw discloses that the physical thickness of each layer of a composite layer may be no more than about 250Å (Table A). Therefore, Depauw discloses a coating carried by a substrate comprising an intermediate dielectric stack comprising zinc oxide/silicon nitride/zinc oxide/silicon nitride/zinc oxide.

Depauw does not mention a specific embodiment wherein each of the layers of the first dielectric have an optical thickness greater than the optical thickness of any of the layers of the second dielectric, but DePauw does disclose that a variety of layer thickness combinations may be utilized (see Table A). Depauw appears to be silent with regards to why the intermediate dielectric stack thicknesses are to be varied, therefore, it would have been obvious to look to the prior art for the reason. Proscia provides this conventional teaching by disclosing that the optical features and properties (transmittance, reflectance, emissivity, and color) of a glass coated article can be readily determined empirically by those skilled in the art or, for example, by employing a commercially available optics prediction software program. Proscia discloses that typically a graphic presentation of the optical properties of a given glazing article, sorted by individual layer thickness and refractive index, can be used to determine the regions of optimum film stack

Art Unit: 1771

design (see entire document including the paragraph bridging columns 6 and 7). Considering that the current specification fails to teach or suggest unexpected results relating to the claimed thickness construction, and considering that the applicant fails to evidence any unexpected results associated with the claimed thickness construction, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the thicknesses of the layers, such as currently claimed, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that layer thicknesses determine properties such as transmittance, reflectance, emissivity, and color and because Proscia discloses that discovering an optimum value of the result effective variable (layer thicknesses) involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 7, 17 and 20, Depauw discloses that the layers are preferably applied by sputtering (column 5, lines 60-61). The applicants disclose in the specification that zinc oxide is a polycrystalline material when applied in thin films via sputtering (see specification page 12, lines 17-18). The applicants also disclose that thin layers of silicon nitride can be thought of as substantially amorphous even after tempering (see specification page 12, lines 22-23). Therefore, it appears that the zinc oxide layers of Depauw are polycrystalline and the silicon nitride layers of Depauw are amorphous.

Regarding claim 24, Depauw discloses that the physical thickness of each layer of a composite layer may be no more than about 22.5 nm (Table A).

5. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,090,481 to Depauw in view of USPN 5,248,545 to Proscia as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-20 and 24 above, and further in view of USPN 5,837,361 to Glaser et al. (hereinafter referred to as Glaser).

Depauw discloses that a sacrificial metal layer, such as a titanium layer, may be disposed above each infrared reflective silver layer (column 5, lines 11-12 and lines 46-54), but DePauw does not specifically mention a layer of niobium. Glaser discloses that titanium and niobium are known sacrificial metal layers (column 3, lines 49-61). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the sacrificial metal layer from any suitable sacrificial metal, such as niobium, as taught by Glaser, because it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability.

6. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,090,481 to Depauw in view of USPN 5,248,545 to Proscia in view of USPN 6,030,671 to Yang et al. (hereinafter referred to as Yang) in view of USPN 4,900,634 to Terneu et al. (hereinafter referred to as Terneu).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-20 and 24, Depauw discloses a coating carried by a substrate having a surface comprising from the substrate surface outwardly an inner dielectric layer, a first infrared reflective layer, an intermediate dielectric layer, a second infrared reflective layer, and an outer dielectric layer (column 3, lines 26-39). Depauw discloses that each dielectric layer can be a composite layer formed of successive subsidiary layers of different compositions from each other (column 5, lines 31-40 and Table A). Depauw discloses that the dielectric materials include zinc oxide, tin oxide, and silicon nitride (column 5, lines 23-30). Depauw discloses that the physical thickness of each layer of a composite layer may be no more than about 250Å (Table A). Therefore, Depauw discloses a coating carried by a substrate

Art Unit: 1771

comprising an intermediate dielectric stack comprising zinc oxide/silicon nitride/zinc oxide/silicon nitride/zinc oxide.

Depauw does not mention a specific embodiment wherein each of the layers of the first dielectric have an optical thickness greater than the optical thickness of any of the layers of the second dielectric, but DePauw does disclose that a variety of layer thickness combinations may be utilized (see Table A). Depauw appears to be silent with regards to why the intermediate dielectric stack thicknesses are to be varied, therefore, it would have been obvious to look to the prior art for the reason. Proscia provides this conventional teaching by disclosing that the optical features and properties (transmittance, reflectance, emissivity, and color) of a glass coated article can be readily determined empirically by those skilled in the art or, for example, by employing a commercially available optics prediction software program. Proscia discloses that typically a graphic presentation of the optical properties of a given glazing article, sorted by individual layer thickness and refractive index, can be used to determine the regions of optimum film stack design (see entire document including the paragraph bridging columns 6 and 7). Considering that the current specification fails to teach or suggest unexpected results relating to the claimed thickness construction, and considering that the applicant fails to evidence any unexpected results associated with the claimed thickness construction, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the thicknesses of the layers, such as currently claimed, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that layer thicknesses determine properties such as transmittance, reflectance, emissivity, and color and because Proscia discloses that discovering an optimum value of the result effective variable (layer thicknesses) involves only routine skill in the art.

In the event that it is shown that Depauw does not disclose the use of an intermediate dielectric stack comprising silicon nitride with sufficient specificity, Yang is relied upon to disclose that it is known in the art that silicon nitride protects an infrared reflective layer material from oxidation and corrosion while increasing the visible light transmission of the film (see entire document including column 6, lines 20-32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the intermediate dielectric stack with silicon nitride, because silicon nitride protects the infrared reflective layer material from oxidation and corrosion while increasing the visible light transmission of the film.

In the event that it is shown that Depauw does not disclose the use of an intermediate dielectric stack comprising alternating thin layers of an oxide and silicon nitride with sufficient specificity, Terneu is relied upon to disclose that it is known in the art that internal defects affect haze and that thinner layers result in less haze (see entire document including column 2, lines 23-68). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the intermediate dielectric stack with alternating thin layers of an oxide and silicon nitride, rather than a single thick layer of silicon nitride, because internal defects affect haze and that thinner layers result in less haze.

Regarding claims 7, 17 and 20, Depauw discloses that the layers are preferably applied by sputtering (column 5, lines 60-61). The applicants disclose in the specification that zinc oxide is a polycrystalline material when applied in thin films via sputtering (see specification page 12, lines 17-18). The applicants also disclose that thin layers of silicon nitride can be thought of as substantially amorphous even after tempering (see specification page 12, lines 22-23).

Art Unit: 1771

Therefore, it appears that the zinc oxide layers of Depauw are polycrystalline and the silicon nitride layers of Depauw are amorphous.

Regarding claim 24, Depauw discloses that the physical thickness of each layer of a composite layer may be no more than about 22.5 nm (Table A).

7. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,090,481 to Depauw in view of USPN 5,248,545 to Proscia in view of USPN 6,030,671 to Yang in view of USPN 4,900,634 to Terneu as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-20 and 24 above, and further in view of USPN 5,837,361 to Glaser.

Depauw discloses that a sacrificial metal layer, such as a titanium layer, may be disposed above each infrared reflective silver layer (column 5, lines 11-12 and lines 46-54), but DePauw does not specifically mention a layer of niobium. Glaser discloses that titanium and niobium are known sacrificial metal layers (column 3, lines 49-61). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the sacrificial metal layer from any suitable sacrificial metal, such as niobium, as taught by Glaser, because it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant asserts that the claimed intermediate dielectric stack formed of alternating

Art Unit: 1771

thin layers of different dielectric material unexpectedly resulted in reduced haze. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As evidenced by USPN 4,900,634 to Terneu et al., the results are not unexpected. Terneu et al. discloses that it is known in the art that internal defects affect haze and that thinner layers result in less haze (see entire document including column 2, lines 23-68). In addition, Depauw (primary reference) already discloses the use of alternating thin layers of different dielectric material (column 5, lines 31-40), therefore, even if the results were unexpected, which they are not, the unexpected results would not overcome any statement of obviousness because no obviousness statement was made in regards to the use of an intermediate dielectric stack formed of alternating thin layers of different dielectric material.

The applicant also asserts that the particular relative thicknesses exhibit unexpected results. The applicant asserts that by limiting the thickness of the second and fourth intermediate dielectric layers the "stress, absorption, etc." would be limited. The current specification is silent regarding the stress, absorption, etc. effects of limiting the thickness of the second and fourth intermediate dielectric layers. The applicant has failed to evidence said unexpected results.

The applicant asserts that the cited prior art provides no motivation to for varying the intermediate dielectric stack layer thicknesses as claimed. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Depauw does not mention a specific embodiment wherein each of the layers of the first dielectric have an optical thickness greater than the optical thickness of any of the layers of the second dielectric, but DePauw does disclose that a variety of layer thickness combinations may be utilized (see Table A). Depauw appears to be silent with regards to why the intermediate dielectric stack thicknesses are to be varied, therefore, it would have been obvious to look to the

Art Unit: 1771

prior art for the reason. Proscia provides this conventional teaching by disclosing that the optical features and properties (transmittance, reflectance, emissivity, and color) of a glass coated article can be readily determined empirically by those skilled in the art or, for example, by employing a commercially available optics prediction software program. Proscia discloses that typically a graphic presentation of the optical properties of a given glazing article, sorted by individual layer thickness and refractive index, can be used to determine the regions of optimum film stack design (see entire document including the paragraph bridging columns 6 and 7). Considering that the current specification fails to teach or suggest unexpected results relating to the claimed thickness construction, and considering that the applicant fails to evidence any unexpected results associated with the claimed thicknesses, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the thicknesses of the layers, such as currently claimed, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that layer thicknesses determine properties such as transmittance, reflectance, emissivity, and color and because Proscia discloses that discovering an optimum value of the result effective variable (layer thicknesses) involves only routine skill in the art.

In response, the applicant asserts that Depauw is not concerned with varying the layer thicknesses of the intermediate dielectric stack. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Table A clearly illustrates Depauw varying the intermediate dielectric stack layers. Depauw is clearly concerned with varying the thickness of the intermediate dielectric stack individual layers.

Art Unit: 1771

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

atp

g72 8/7/06

ANDREW T. PIZIALI
PATENT EXAMINER